10c. A COPY $1 A YEAR

MOTHER EARTH

Monthly Magazine Devoted to Social Science and Literature

Published Every 15th of the Month

EMMA GOLDMAN, Proprietor, 210 East Thirteenth Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter April 9, 1906, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Vol. IV **NOVEMBER, 1909** **No. 9**

FRANCISCO FERRER

BY CHARLES E. HOOPER.

Still groans Prometheus bound, and still descends,
From yon man-fashioned Phantom of the skies,
The triple-headed bird of prey that blends
Warfare with greed and sacerdotal lies.

Soldier of Truth, thy death-drops we salute;
In them Humanity is heart renewed;
Dried be the tear, the rising curse be mute;
In blood lies Liberty's beatitude.

But what of Spain—priest-trampled Spain? Who knows
To-morrow's doom of infamy or fame?
At least in thy loved country still live those
Who burn to spread thy martyred spirit's flame.

"Long live the Modern School"—Thy message, flung
Straight to the murderous muzzles ere they sped
Destruction to a brain too finely strung,
Re-echoed, links the living to the dead;

The living, not in guilty Spain alone,
But wheresoever men have eyes to see
And hearts to feel: There, ready, stands the throne,
Reared by Light-yielding labors like thine own,
That waits thy spirit's King, the World-community.

—London Literary Guide.

OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

THE whole history of the Catholic Church has been an uninterrupted orgy of violence and crime, persecution and murder. The vicars of the meek Carpenter who taught "Love thine enemies" have ever preached his gospel with rack and thumbscrew. Fire and sword were their good Christian weapons. Darkness and ignorance their supreme opportunity. The terrible result is all too evident in countries ruled by the Church. Ignorance and poverty are most frightful in proportion to Catholic influence. Spain is its stronghold. Fearfully the black beast of Rome guards her ancient domain. She trembles at the approach of light. Justly she sees in the torch of science the threatened destruction of her tyrannical power. The Educator is her most feared enemy.

In the present, as in the past, the Church dreads nothing more than ideas,—ideas of liberty, of light and justice. Their torch-bearers are blasphemers, heretics. They must die, for the greater glory of the Church and the continued reign of superstition and darkness.

Thus Ferrer had to die. Nay, more. He had to expiate a double heresy, for he blasphemed both Church and State. Too wide his view to be confined to the peril of priestcraft. Too clear his sight not to realize the blight of authority, civil no less than religious, that holds mankind in bondage. Full well he knew that in the lexicon of the State Liberty has no more place than Light in that of the Church. Against both these powers of darkness Francisco Ferrer was a mighty protestant. He opposed to their pernicious, enslaving activity the most efficacious method: the enlightenment of the child. He knew that an unenslaved child meant a free man. But this great crime neither Church nor State could forgive. The black Shylocks demanded their pound of flesh. A servile government readily acquiesced, and thus the noblest, truest friend of mankind was assassinated.

* * *

SELDOM has the solidarity of governments been more convincingly demonstrated than by the Ferrer case. Governments often deem it necessary to make hostile demonstrations against each other. Usually it is the

stronger taking advantage of a weaker power, for the benefit of home capitalists, or to divert popular discontent into artificial channels, thus fanning the fires of jingoism, so conducive to the interests of despotism.

But in the Ferrer case the various States have given a remarkable proof of solidarity. No European government found a single word of censure for the farcical trial and atrocious murder at Montjuich. And our own government, forever pretending to be truly representative,—why has it ignored popular indignation at Ferrer's assassination? Why does it remain mute in the face of the world-wide protest? Neither Federal nor State government dared to utter a word in condemnation of the foulest deed of the twentieth century.

The powers at Washington never lose time in expressing, unauthorized, "the sympathy of the American people" for some royal idiot overtaken by the hand of an avenging Nemesis. This has been repeatedly done within recent years, without the knowledge or consent of the people; in fact, contrary to their desires and expressed sentiment, and in direct defiance of the American tradition abhorring the tyranny of the Old World despotisms. Why, then, is Washington mute at the outrage committed in Spain? If it may without authorization express the alleged sympathy of the American people for a dead tyrant, may it not voice the expressed indignation of the people at the wrong done to *humanity?* If the authorities, State and Federal, had possessed the faintest spark of manhood, they should have first expressed to the *people of Spain* and the orphans of Ferrer the sympathy of the American public and its abhorrence of the assassination. Then the official representatives in America of the Catholic Church and Spanish government should have been notified that the American people could not tolerate in their midst the official presence of assassins' agents.

Such should have been the attitude of a government having even the faintest pretentions to being representative of the nation. But such pretentions are the veriest hypocrisy. Governments represent nothing but chicanery, fraud, and the violence of the few toward the many. The very essence of governments is suppression and murder. Their mission is to defend and preserve existing

conditions of injustice, oppression, and tyranny—and this is why all governments are solidaric.

* * *

LET no one deceive himself with the belief that the dastardly crime of Montjuich would not be possible in these United States.

It may seem like a far cry from America to Spain. And yet the comparison is justified. Indeed, this country has but scant reason to point the finger of scorn at benighted Spain, in the fond belief that we are more civilized, more progressive.

If the possibility of a Ferrer outrage may serve as a criterion of a people's place in the ethical progress of the world, then the "land of the free and the home of the brave" properly belongs in the utmost rear of the march.

Just twenty-two years ago a tragedy was enacted upon the stage of American life which, for brutality and monstrous malignity, far overshadows the terrible happening in Spain. Eight of the noblest of men were torn from the midst of their friends and condemned to death under circumstances closely resembling the martyrdom of Ferrer. As in the case of the Spanish educator, the only crime of our Chicago comrades consisted in their loyal service to humanity. They had raised their voices in protest against social injustice and devoted their lives to the enlightenment of their fellow-men. This was the most unpardonable crime man could be guilty of—in Spain as in America,—a crime punishable with death.

The circumstances surrounding the trial of our Chicago martyrs were also peculiarly like those of Ferrer's. Perjury and false evidence were resorted to by an American court to accomplish the fiendish plot against the men accused of complicity in the Haymarket bomb incident. Not a shred of evidence could be produced against our comrades, as was subsequently proved by Governor Altgeld, who liberated the three imprisoned Anarchists. But lack of evidence could be no obstacle to the infamous cabal of authority and privilege: in spite of their proved innocence five men were judicially slaughtered.

If anything, the Chicago court was more brutal, more atrocious than that of Spain. The latter at least has the excuse—pitiable as it is—of an actual condition of martial law. Nothing of the kind existed in Chicago, in

1887. Our comrades were tried, not by a court martial, like Ferrer, but by a civil tribunal which decreed the slaying of the Anarchists by resorting to every conceivable perfidy within the range of judicial authority.

* * *

TO those who still cling to the ragged edges of American liberty, the latest governmental outrages should furnish sufficient proof that liberty is no more.

The President of a "free" country, at the heavy expense of a "free" people, embraces the tyrant of Mexico, whose dark and criminal deeds surpass even those of the Russian autocracy. The government of a "free" country lends itself as hangman of the personal rights and liberties of people whose only offence consists in daring to oppose the despotic régime of the Mexican Tsar. At the latter's request De Lara, a cultured Mexican residing at Los Angeles, has been arrested, refused a trial, and is about to be turned over to the tender mercies of the Weyler of Mexico.

In our own city, a brilliant writer and cartoonist, Carlo De Fornaro, well known in artistic circles, has been convicted of criminal libel, because he, too, had dared to raise his voice in behalf of his outraged country. In his work, "Diaz, Tsar of Mexico," Fornaro boldly tore the mask off the hypocritical face of Perfidious Diaz, that the world might see him as he is.

The portrait drawn by the pen of this gifted artist was the writing on the wall which evidently disturbed the slumbers of the Mexican oppressor. Criticism and the truth are ever a menace to tyranny. The Mexican government had successfully suppressed free expression in its own country and has now sent its representative to accomplish the same result in America. That Diaz could fully rely on his colleagues in Washington to do his bidding is best proved by the outrageous action of the jury which found Fornaro guilty of libelling —Diaz. As if the English tongue is rich enough in strong expressions to libel a Diaz.

The thinking element of the West has awakened to the danger of Mexican rule in America, inasmuch as they have inaugurated a tremendous agitation in behalf of De Lara. Shall we in the East not follow

their commendable example? A strong and vigorous movement should immediately be started in behalf of Fornaro, in behalf of free speech. It behooves us to lend our assistance in freeing Mexico, for the time is not far when we shall need the assistance of Mexico to free us.

* * *

THE killing of Prince Ito by a Korean patriot marks an important step in the awakening of that unfortunate country. The birth of the individual revolutionist historically precedes national revolt. And surely Korea has sufficient cause to rejoice over the deed of her son, more courageous than his brothers. For Ito, as Resident General of Korea, proved a veritable demon in the ferocious suppression of every aspiration of the Koreans for national independence and well-being. His administration reduced that country to the last extreme of slavery. The shot that laid Ito low was but the echo of a people's desperate cry for relief.

* * *

IT is no exaggeration to say that Samuel Gompers is the most perniciously reactionary factor in the American labor movement. It is he, chiefly, who is responsible for the present pitiful, helpless condition of the organized workingmen of this country. His whole official life has been devoted to instilling the belief that the true solution of the labor question is to be found in the "closer approach of capital and labor." He has preached the gospel of harmony between master and slave till the workers have grown to look upon the exploiting parasites as their true benefactors. His craft union methods and tactics have encouraged internal strife and robbed the workers of their initiative and independence. They have been persistently drilled to rely on the authority of their leaders—in and out of the union—and their minds poisoned and their energy paralyzed by the sanctity of contracts. Self-help and direct economic action have been tabooed, legal justice eulogized, and the courts apotheosized till labor has become emasculated of all manhood.

Not content with having degraded and debauched

American labor, Gompers undertook to carry his pernicious gospel to the workers of Europe. On his recent trip abroad he exhausted the colors of the rainbow in painting the prosperity and power of the American workingmen. He was inexpressibly shocked by the miserable condition of the wage slaves of the Old World; he severely criticised their ineffective methods of fighting the encroachments of capital, contrasting them with the enlightened and successful tactics of the "world's most powerful labor body," the A. F. of L.

Having thus satisfactorily—to himself, chiefly—accomplished his mission, Gompers set sail for America, the Eldorado of labor.

But oh, the irony of fate! The last strains of his swan-like song had scarcely left his lips, when the electric wire flashed the news to Gompers that the Court of Appeals had ordered him to be thrown into prison! It had confirmed the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, declaring—in essence—that American labor had no rights as against capital, and no standing in the courts of law. Did Gompers, the head of the "world's most powerful labor body," indignantly protest against this infamous judicial raping of his organization? Not he. He is too loyal a slave to rebel against sacred decisions of the august judiciary. In the last issue of the *American Federationist* Gompers servilely proclaims his unshakable faith in the ultimate triumph of justice and calls upon the faithful to—appeal to a higher court.

Sancta Simplicitas, if not worse. Had Gompers the courage to call upon American labor to proclaim a General Strike as a protest against the court's decision, ... but, then, neither Gompers nor his organization has the courage of virile manhood.

* * *

FOR years New York and Brooklyn have been police-ridden cities. So much so that one was not quite safe from them in his own home. As to outrages on fundamental principles, that was an open daily exercise of the police.

Since the removal of the military police Commissioner Bingham, his successor has tried to rescue free

speech, at least, from the clutches of his subordinates, and especially to free hallkeepers from the police reign of terror.

Like all reforms, the efforts of our new Commissioner have succeeded in relieving the agony, but not in curing the disease. There are still numerous precincts where captains reign supreme, bullying hall owners and preventing the holding of meetings.

One of these heroes, Captain Shaw, has just been removed to Brooklyn, where he continues his old tactics practiced for many years in New York.

A meeting of Comrade Goldman was stopped November 5th in the habitual sneaky way: intimidation of the hallkeeper. When Captain Shaw was confronted by the order of his superior to keep hands off the meeting, the brave knight lied himself out of the difficulty, throwing the blame on the lights in the hall, which had suddenly refused to burn. Our friends procured from the Commissioner permission to hold an open air meeting, at which they addressed—during an hour and a half—an audience of three thousand people attracted by the police closing the hall.

The meeting was unusually quiet and orderly, which did not seem to please the Brooklyn police. Suddenly a sergeant appeared on the scene, roughly demanding our permit. When Comrade Reitman did not comply quick enough with the demand, he was placed under arrest. The following morning he was fined five dollars for the terrible offence of having told the policeman that it was none of his business whether we had a permit. Not a policeman's business to meddle in the free exercise of a right? Not his business to break up a peaceful meeting? That was, indeed, a crime.

The comic side of the affair was furnished by His Majesty, Capt. Shaw. He appeared before the Judge to swear out a warrant for Comrade Emma Goldman, who, he said, had called him a grafter and had attacked the Catholic Church. Even a Brooklyn judge could see the humor of the situation. He would not issue the warrant, but went out of his way to tell our comrade that he knew her theories stood for kindness. It is to be regretted, however, that the Judge doesn't

know enough of them to practice kindness in the courts. The brutality and coarseness of the officers that morning were the most disgraceful scene we have witnessed in a long time.

* * *

THE industrial Workers of the World of Spokane, Wash., are setting a splendid example of fighting the enemies of speech. The local authorities had suddenly decided to stop the I. W. W. open-air meetings. Our Spokane comrades have been carrying on an energetic propaganda, striking at the very vitals of Mammon by their fearless denunciation of the employment sharks—the modern eunuchs of capitalism. Hence the attempt to throttle free speech.

But our friends were not to be so easily daunted. They insisted on their rights. They were not naïve enough to believe that anything would be "granted" them. They had the courage to *demand* and *take* their rights, by continuing to hold open-air meetings, police orders to the contrary notwithstanding. The energy and determination of the brave fighters resulted in numerous arrests: Comrade Elisabeth Gurley Flynn and two other I. W. W. organizers, as well as the editors of the *Industrial Worker* and the secretary of the Central Committee of the I. W. W. unions, were thrown into jail. But prison and threats of bodily injury could not discourage these devoted men and women. No sooner was one speaker dragged off the platform than another took his place. Scores of fighters stood ready to assert their right of free speech, so that the Spokane prison is now overfilled, and plenty of comrades are on hand to continue the fight.

That these methods of establishing our rights are the proper ones has already been proved by Comrade Flynn and others at Missoula, Mont. There the number of I. W. W. people willing and ready to go to prison for free speech so overtaxed the town jail's capacity that the authorities were forced to cry for mercy. They feared the town would go into bankruptcy if our comrades persisted in becoming the city's free boarders. Thus freedom of speech was estab-

lished in Missoula. Thus also—and thus alone—will it have to be established everywhere.

* * *

THE case of Comrades Schreiber and Adams, now before the Supreme Court of New Jersey, has again demonstrated to what depths government will stoop in its persecution of Anarchists.

Schreiber and Adams were convicted last June in the Trenton court of "conspiracy to rob" (no robbery had taken place), on the exclusive testimony of a certain New York police spy and his assistants. The evidence against them was so flimsy, the trial such a farce, that the Machinist Union (of which Schreiber was a most active member) took up the matter, raised funds and appealed the case to the Supreme Court.

The arguments of counsel before the latter body are sufficient to convince even a prejudiced mind that the verdict of guilty against Schreiber and Adams was the direct result of police conspirators seeking promotion. Of course, the underlying reason for the prosecution was the circumstance of the prisoners' being Anarchists.

Our experience with authority has been of a character to exclude surprise at any atrocity government might commit. But that workingmen, strikers at that, should lend themselves the willing tools of a police outrage, is very sad indeed. We blush for American labor to acknowledge that the jury which condenmed Schreiber and Adams consisted almost exclusively of striking hatters.

* * *

WE hail the resurrection of the *Firebrand,* the fortnightly Anarchist review published and edited by Ross Winn. In these days of general apathy and ever-growing encroachment of despotism, every additional champion of Liberty is a valuable aid in the service of humanity. Comrade Winn is especially fitted for the task: he is a born fighter, with a clear, broad outlook, and a sharp and fearless pen. The trumpet calls, the need is great—Welcome, Comrade!

Those wishing to subscribe for the *Firebrand* may address Ross Winn, Mt. Juliet, Tenn., or the office of MOTHER EARTH.

L'ÉCOLE RÉNOVÉE

By FRANCISCO FERRER.

Literal translation of an article written by Francisco Ferrer for the L'École Rénovée, the Paris review published in the interests of Modern Education.

TO those who wish to renovate the education of children two methods are open: To work for the transformation of the school by studying the child, so as to prove scientifically that the present organization of education is defective and to bring about progressive modification; or, to found new schools in which shall be directly applied those principles corresponding directly to the ideal of society and of its units, as held by those who eschew the conventionalities, prejudices, cruelties, trickeries, and falsehoods, upon which modern society is based.

The first method certainly offers great advantages. It corresponds to that evolutionary conception which all men of science defend, and which alone, according to them, can succeed.

In theory they are right, and we are quite ready to recognize it.

It is evident that exepriments in psychology and physiology must lead to important changes in matters of education: that teachers, being better able to understand the child, will know better how to adapt their instruction to natural laws. I even grant that such evolution will be in the direction of liberty, for I am convinced that constraint arises only from ignorance, and that the educator who is really worthy of the name will obtain his results through the spontaneous response of the child, whose desires he will learn to know, and whose development he will try to further by giving it every possible gratification.

But in reality, I do not believe that those who struggle for human emancipation can expect much from this method. Governments have ever been careful to hold a high hand over the education of the people. They know, better than anyone else, that their power is based almost entirely on the school. Hence, they monopolize it more

and more. The time is past when they opposed the diffusion of instruction, and when they sought to restrain the education of the masses. These tactics were formerly possible, because the economic life of the nations allowed the prevalence of popular ignorance, that ignorance which renders mastery easy. But circumstances have changed. The progress of science, discoveries of all kinds, have revolutionized the conditions of labor and production. It is no longer possible for a people to remain ignorant: it must be educated in order that the economic situation of one country may hold its own and make headway against the universal competition. In consequence, governments want education; they want a more and more complete organization of the school, not because they hope for the renovation of society through education, but because they need individuals, workmen, perfected instruments of labor, to make their industrial enterprises and the capital employed in them profitable. And we have seen the most reactionary governments follow this movement; they have realized perfectly that their former tactics were becoming dangerous to the economic life of the nations, and that it is necessary to adapt popular education to new necessities.

But it would be a great mistake to suppose that the directors have not foreseen the dangers which the intelligent development of the people might create for them, and that it was necessary for them to change their methods of keeping the mastery. These methods have likewise been adopted to the new conditions of life, and they have labored to keep a hold over the evolution of ideas. At the same time that they seek to preserve the beliefs upon which social discipline was formerly based, they have sought to give to conceptions born of scientific effort a signification which could do no harm to established institutions. And to that end they took possession of the school. They who formerly left the priests in charge of the education of the people, because the priests were perfectly suited to the task, their instruction being at the service of authority, now took up everywhere the direction of scholarly education.

The danger, for them, lay in the awakening of human intelligence to the new outlook on life; the awakening, in the depths of men's consciousness, of a will towards

emancipation. It would have been foolish to combat the evolving forces; they had to be driven into channels. That is the reason why, far from adhering to the old procedures of government, they adopted new ones, and evidently efficacious ones. It did not require great genius to find this solution; the simple pressure of facts led the men in power to understand what they must oppose to the apparent perils.

They founded schools, labored to spread education on all sides, and if there were those among them who at first resisted this impulse—for its diverse tendencies favored certain antagonistic political parties—all soon understood that it was better to yield to it, and that the best tactics were to assure the defense of their interests and their principles by new means. Forthwith began terrible struggles for the conquest of the School; in every country these struggles are still continuing with intensity; here, bourgeois republican society triumphs; there, clericalism. All sides know the importance of the game, and recoil at no sacrifice to secure a victory. Everyone's cry is: "For and by the School." And the good people ought to be touched by so much solicitude! Everybody thirsts for their elevation by education, and by consequence—their happiness! Formerly some could say: "These others want to keep you in ignorance that they may the better exploit you: we want to see you educated and free." Now that is no longer possible; they have built schools on every corner, for every sort of instruction.

It is in this unanimous change of ideas among the ruling classes in respect to the school, that I find reason to be suspicious of their good-will, and the explanation of the facts which actuate my doubts as to the efficacy of the methods of renovation which certain reformers want to put in operation. These reformers are, moreover, very indifferent, generally speaking, to the social significance of education; they are men very ardent in the search of scientific truth, but who avoid all questions foreign to the object of their studies. They study patiently to know the child, and will some day tell us—their science is young yet—what methods of education are most suitable for its integral development.

Now this, in some sort, professional indifference is very prejudicial, I think, to the cause they intend to serve.

I do not mean to say that they are unconscious of the realities of the social environment, and I know that they expect the best results for the general welfare from their task. They say: In trying to discover the secrets of the life of the human being, in seeking the processes of its normal physical and psychic development, we give education a form which can not but be favorable to the liberation of energies. We do not wish to devote our attention directly to the liberation of the school: as savants moreover we cannot, for we are not yet able exactly to define what is to be done. We shall proceed by slow degrees, convinced that the school will be transformed just in proportion to our discoveries, by the force of events themselves. If you ask us what are our hopes for mankind, we agree with you in foreseeing an evolution in the direction of a wide emancipation of the child and of humanity through science; but in that case again we are persuaded that our work must be directed entirely toward that end, and will attain it by the most rapid and direct course.

This reasoning is apparently logical, and no one would dare to contradict it. And yet it is mixed considerably with illusion. Yes, if the governing powers had, as men, the same ideas as benevolent reformers, if they were really concerned for the continuous reorganization of society in the sense of the progressive disappearance of slavery, we might admit that scientific effort alone would improve the destiny of nations. But we should reckon without our host. We know too well that those who dispute for power, have in view nothing but the defense of their own interests; that they busy themselves only with conquering what they want for themselves, for the satisfaction of their appetites. Long ago we ceased to believe in the words with which they mask their ambitions. Certain naïve persons still refuse to believe that there is not among them, all the same, some little sincerity, and imagine that they, too, sometimes desire the happiness of their fellows. But these become fewer and fewer, and the positivism of the century has become far too cruel for us to deceive ourselves longer as to the intentions of those who govern us.

Just as they knew how to get out of the difficulty, when the necessity for education became evident, in such

a way as to prevent that education from becoming a danger, just so they will know how to organize the school in accordance with the new discoveries of science that nothing may endanger their supremacy. These are ideas which are certainly not received without difficulty; but when one has seen, from close by, what takes place and how things are in reality arranged, one can no longer be caught by the whistling of words.

Oh, what have people not expected, what do they not expect still, from education! The majority of progressive men expect everything from it, and it is only in these later days that some begin to understand that if offers nothing but illusions. We perceive the utter uselessness of this learning acquired in the schools by the systems of education at present in practice, we see that we expected and hoped in vain. It is because the organization of the school, far from spreading the ideal which we imagined, has made education the most powerful means of enslavement in the hands of the governing powers to-day. Their teachers are only the conscious or unconscious instruments of these powers, modeled moreover according to their principles; they have from their youth up, and more than any one else, been subjected to the discipline of their authority; few indeed are those who have escaped the influence of this domination; and these remain powerless, because the school organization constrains them so strongly that they cannot but obey it. It is not my purpose here to examine the nature of this organization. It is sufficiently well known for me to characterize it in one word: constraint. The school imprisons children physically, intellectually, and morally, in order to direct the development of their faculties in the paths desired. It deprives them of contact with nature, in order to model them after its own pattern. And this is the explanation of all which I have here set forth: The care which governments have taken to direct the education of the people, and the bankruptcy of the hopes of believers in liberty. The education of to-day is nothing more than drill. I refuse to believe that the systems employed have been combined with any exact design for bringing about the results desired. That would suppose genius. But things take place precisely as if this education responded to some vast entire concep-

tion in a manner really remarkable. It could not have been better done. What accomplished it, was simply that the leading inspiration was the principle of discipline and of authority which guides social organizers at all times. They have but one clearly defined idea, one will, viz.: Children must be accustomed to obey, to believe, to think, according to the social dogmas which govern us. Hence, education cannot be other than such as it is to-day. It is not a matter of seconding the spontaneous development of the faculties of the child, of leaving it free to satisfy its physical, intellectual, and moral needs; it is a matter of imposing ready-made ideas upon it; a matter even of preventing it from ever thinking otherwise than is willed for the maintenance of the institutions of this society; it is a matter of making it an individual strictly adapted to the social mechanism.

No one should be astonished that such an education has this evil influence upon human emancipation. I repeat, it is but a means of domination in the hands of the governing powers. They have never wanted the uplift of the individual, but his enslavement; and it is perfectly useless to hope anything from the school of to-day.

Now, what has been resulting up until to-day will continue to result in the future. There is no reason for governments to change their system. They have succeeded in making education serve for their advantage; they will likewise know how to make use of any improvements that may be proposed to their advantage.

It is sufficient that they maintain the spirit of the school, the authoritarian discipline which reigns therein, for all innovations to be turned to their profit. And they will watch their opportunity; be sure of that.

I would like to call the attention of my readers to this idea: All the value of education rests in respect for the physical, intellectual, and moral will of the child. Just as in science no demonstration is possible save by facts, just so there is no real education save that which is exempt from all dogmatism, which leaves to the child itself the direction of its effort, and confines itself to the seconding of that effort. Now there is nothing easier than to alter this purpose, and nothing harder than to respect it. Education is always imposing, violating, constraining; the real educator is he who can

best protect the child against his (the teacher's) own ideas, his peculiar whims; he who can best appeal to the child's own energies.

One may judge by this with what ease education receives the stamp they wish to put upon it, and how easy is the task of those who wish to enslave the individual. The best of methods become in their hands only the more powerful and perfect instruments of domination. Our own ideal is certainly that of science, and we demand that we be given the power to educate the child by favoring its development through the satisfaction of all its needs in proportion as these arise and grow.

We are convinced that the education of the future will be of an entirely spontaneous nature; certainly we cannot as yet realize it, but the evolution of methods in the direction of a wider comprehension of the phenomena of life, and the fact that all advances toward perfection mean the overcoming of some constraint, all this indicates that we are in the right when we hope for the deliverance of the child through science.

Is this the ideal of those who control the present school organization? Is this what they, too, want to realize? and they, too, do they aspire to overcome restraint? Not at all. They will employ the newest and most effective means to the same end as now, that is to say, the formation of beings who will accept all the conventions, all the prejudices, all the lies upon which society is founded.

Let us not fear to say that we want men capable of evolving without stopping, capable of destroying and renewing their environments without cessation, of renewing themselves also; men whose intellectual independence will be their greatest force, who will attach themselves to nothing, always ready to accept what is best, happy in the triumph of new ideas, aspiring to live multiple lives in one life. Society fears such men; we must not then hope it will ever want an education able to give them to us.

* * *

What, then, is our own mission? What method are we going to choose to contribute to the renovation of the school?

We shall follow the labors of the scientists who study

the child with the greatest attention, and we shall eagerly seek for means of applying their experience to the education we wish to build up, in the direction of an ever fuller liberation of the individual. But how can we attain our end? Shall it not be by putting ourselves directly to the work favoring the foundation of new schools, which shall be ruled as much as possible by this spirit of liberty, which we forefeel will dominate the entire work of education in the future.

A trial has been made which, for the present, has already given excellent results. We can destroy all which in the present school answers to the organization of constraint, the artificial surroundings by which the children are separated from nature and life, the intellectual and moral discipline made use of to impose ready-made ideas upon them, beliefs which deprave and annihilate natural bent. Without fear of deceiving ourselves, we can restore the child to the environment which entices it, the environment of nature in which he will be in contact with all that he loves, and in which impressions of life will replace fastidious book-learning. If we did no more than that, we should already have prepared in great part the deliverance of the child.

In such conditions we might already freely apply the data of science, and labor most fruitfully.

I know very well that we could not thus realize all our hopes, that we should often be forced, for lack of knowledge, to employ undesirable methods; but a certitude would sustain us in our effort, namely, that even without reaching our aim completely we should do more and better in our still imperfect work than the present school accomplishes. I like the free spontaneity of a child who knows nothing, better than the word knowledge and intellectual deformity of a child who has been subjected to our present education.

What we have attempted at Barcelona, others have attempted elsewhere, and we have all seen that the work is possible. And I think it should be begun without delay. We should not wait until the study of the child has been completed before undertaking the renovation of the school; if we must wait for that, we shall never do anything. We will apply what we do know, and, progressively, all that we shall learn. Already, a complete plan

of rational education is possible, and, in such schools as we conceive, children may develop, happy and free, according to their natural tendencies. We shall labor to perfect and extend it.

It is with this object in view that this Review has been founded, that the International League for the rational education of children has been founded. We ask the aid of all those who desire, with us, the liberation of the child, who desire through it to contribute to the coming of a more beautiful, a stronger humanity. In this Review we shall confine ourselves to the discussion of a plan of rational education, such as it is possible to carry out in these days.

Moreover, as soon as circumstances permit, we shall take up again the work begun in Barcelona, we shall rebuild the schools destroyed by our adversaries. In the meantime, we shall labor to found a normal school in Barcelona, for the training of teachers destined to second us later; we shall create a library of the modern school, in which such books will be published as will serve for the education of the educators, as well as for that of the children. We shall also found a pedagogic museum, containing a collection of all the necessary materials for a renovated school.

Such are our plans. We are aware that their realization will be difficult. But we want to begin, convinced that we shall be aided in our task by those who are everywhere struggling for human liberation from dogmas and conventions which assure the support of the present iniquitous social organization.

* * *

FRANCISCO FERRER

By EMMA GOLDMAN.

NEVER before in the history of the world has one man's death so thoroughly united struggling mankind.

Never before has one man's death called forth such a universal cry of indignation.

Never before has one man's death so completely torn the veil from the sinister face of the hydra-headed monster, the Catholic Church.

Never before in the history of the world has one man's death so shaken the thrones of the golden calf, and spread ghastly fear among its worshippers.

One solitary death, yet more powerful than a million cringing lives. More powerful even than that black spectre which, for almost two thousand years, has tortured man's soul and poisoned his mind.

Francisco Ferrer stretched in the ditch at Montjuich, his tender, all-too-loving heart silenced by twelve bullets —yet speaking, speaking in a voice so loud, so clear, so deep. . . . Wherein lies the secret of this wonderful phenomenon?

Francisco Ferrer, the Anarchist and teacher? Yes, but there were other Anarchists and teachers: Louise Michel and Elisée Reclus, for instance, beloved by many. Yet why has their death not proved such a tremendous force?

Francisco Ferrer, the founder of the Modern School? But, then, the Modern School did not originate with Francisco Ferrer, though it was he who carried it to Spain. The father of the Modern School is Paul Robin, the latter-day Dr. Pascal,—old in years, with the spirit of Spring, tender and loving, he taught modern methods of education long before Ferrer. He organized the first Modern School at Cempuis, near Paris, wherein children found a home, a warm, beautiful atmosphere.

Again, there is Sebastian Faure and his Beehive. He, too, has founded a Modern School, a free, happy, and harmonious place for children. There are scores of modern schools in France, yet no other man's death will act as a fertilizing force as that of Francisco Ferrer.

Was Ferrer's influence so great because of a lifetime of devoted effort? During eight years his heroic spirit strove to spread the light in the dark land of his birth. For eight years he toiled, ceaselessly, to rescue the child from the destructive influence of superstition. One hundred and nine schools with seventy thousand pupils crowned the gigantic efforts of our murdered comrade, while three hundred and eight liberal schools sprang into being, thanks to his beneficial influence. Yet all this and more fails to account for the tremendous volcano that swept the civilized world at Francisco Ferrer's death.

His trial was a farce. The evidence against him per-

jured. But was there ever a time when the State hesitated to resort to perjury when dealing with opponents? Was there ever a time when it exercised justice toward those who endangered its stronghold? The State is the very embodiment of injustice and perjury. Some make a pretence at fairness: Spain was brazen; that is all.

What, then, is the secret of the phenomenon?

* * *

Driven from its omnipotent position of open crime by the world's progress, the Catholic Church had not ceased to be a virulent poison within the social body. Its Borgia methods merely became more hidden, more secret, yet none the less malignant and perfidious. Cowed into apparent submission, it had not dared since the days of Huss and Bruno to openly demand a noble victim's blood. But at last, blinded by arrogance and conceit and the insatiable thirst for martyrs' blood, the Catholic Church forgot the progress of the world, forgot the spirit of our age, forgot the growth of free ideas. As of old, it was the Jesuit hand that stretched forth its bloody fingers to snatch its victim. It was the Archbishop of Barcelona who, in a statement signed by the prelates of the Church, first denounced Ferrer and demanded his life. As of old, Inquisition methods were used in the incarceration and mock trial of Ferrer. No time was to be given the progressive world to check the premeditated murder. Hastily and secretly was the martyr assassinated. Full well the Church knew that the dead cannot be saved.

In vain the frantic efforts of Church and State to connect Francisco Ferrer with the uprising at Barcelona. In vain their delirious cries defaming the character of the dead. In vain the scurrilous attacks of their harlots upon the ideas and comrades of Ferrer—attacks which have now reached even the American press.

Before the awakened consciousness of mankind the world over the Catholic Church stands condemned as the instigator and perpetrator of the foul crime committed at Montjuich. It is this awakened human consciousness which has resurrected Francisco Ferrer.

Therein lies the secret of the force of one man's death, of one solitary man in the ditch of Montjuich.

FERRER'S LAST LETTERS

These letters of Comrade Ferrer, the first two of which were addressed to his friend, M. Naquet, president of the French Committee of Defense for Political Prisoners, were published in "L'Humanité" after having been smuggled out of the prison at Barcelona.

"Prison Cell, Oct. 1, 1909.

"My Dear Friend—They are about to lift the secret why I have been confined here over a month, but I have not yet been permitted to read a letter or paper. I will try to recite my case to you.

"From my letter of the 10th you know that I did not have the least knowledge of the intended general strike of the 26th of April, designed as a protest against the war in Morocco, and I cannot understand how a rumor could be spread that I have provoked it. . . .

"However that may be, I took no steps for protection, feeling sure that as I had nothing whatever to do with the movement I would shortly be let alone; but, behold, a member of my family came from Aletta terribly scared, having heard a young girl say that I was at Pemia, leading a band of incendiaries burning a cloister. This made me reflect. There was no cloister burned at Premia. And I have never set foot in that village. So I prepared to leave the next day and visit some friends for a few days until the excitement could pass over, intending to return as soon as the times became more quiet. . . .

"On the 29th of August I read in the papers that the public prosecutor of the Supreme Court, who had been at Barcelona investigating the situation, had said on leaving the palace, where he had made his report to the king, that I had organized the revolutionary movement in Barcelona and the neighboring villages.

"I could not bear that any longer, and so, in spite of my friends' advice, I resolved to present myself to the authorities to protest against such rumors and such affirmations, no matter from what sources they might come.

"So I left my friend's home on the night of August 31st, so as to arrive in Barcelona without encumbrance and to present myself voluntarily.

"But I had failed to take into account the police in my own village, who arrested me in spite of my entreaties, and in taking me to a judge brought me before the governor of Barcelona.

"The peasants, who all knew me, displayed a revolting savagery. One, especially, named Bernadas Miraltag, who tied my elbows with a cord, threatened several times to smash my skull with his gun, saying that I was the most wicked man on earth, according to what he had been told and read in all the papers. For six hours he kept watch over me in the village hall. Once I asked for a drink. Some one brought me a glass of fresh water, but Bernadas would not loosen my bonds sufficiently so that I could take the glass. He offered to pour it into my mouth himself. When I declined, he had them take away the water without letting me drink.

"I tell you this so as to give you an inkling of the clerical spirit toward me. Well, next I was brought before the governor of Barcelona, who, in answer to my protests of innocence, said that reading of the school books of the Modern School might well be regarded as one of the prime causes of the uprising, therefore I was responsible for the rebellion."

(Here follow some details as to his imprisonment in Barcelona. Ferrer continues:)

"We have now come to the first examination by Commandant Vincente Stivina y Fernandez, the judge charged with the inquiry. That was the day of my arrest, September 1, in the evening. In the course of that examination I received the impression that the judge was really moved by a genuine spirit of justice, and that I would not have to remain long in prison.

"But four days passed without my being called again before the judge. On the 5th I was again summoned.

"But it was not before the same judge. It was a commandant whose name was Valerio Pazo, but who, I quickly discovered, was Becerra del Toro, of evil memory. (Becerra del Toro was the prosecutor general who failed so signally in getting Professor Ferrer condemned to death two years ago.)

"His first action was to have two military surgeons make a searching examination of my body, to find out if I carried any traces of recent blows or wounds. They set

to work examining me from head to foot so minutely that if unhappily in any way I had been injured recently, in all probability I would have been shot immediately.

"On the 9th of September came the first examination before this judge. He attached much importance to a biographical note sent in 1907 to Fournemont for publication in the 'Almanach of the International Federation of Free Thought.' As I had declared that I had nothing to do with any party, political or revolutionary, devoting myself solely to rational education, he seemed to think that he had caught me in a contradiction, because in that note I made revolutionary declarations.

"Later he alluded to several other documents of the same character, but I reminded him that all those matters had been discussed in 1906-7 during my first trial.

"But then came a terrible thing—a revolutionary leaflet, which the police had found in my house, a sheet I had never seen before and which had the appearance of being very old. The judge stated that the police had found that paper in the presence of my brother, my sister, and Mad-de Soledad.

"I then told him that I did not know how that leaflet had got into my house, but that I could affirm that I had never seen it. It spoke of the burning of cloisters, exterminating the congregations, and destroying the banks. Then I understood that it was intended to hold me responsible for all those events I had nothing to do with.

"Ten days passed, and on the 19th of September, coming before the judge, I again protested against that leaflet being used against me, declaring that its presence was owing to an error of the police or the judge, but he insisted that it had been found in the presence of my family.

"The search of my home at Montgat on the 11th day of August, in the presence of my family, by a lieutenant of the civic guards and two of the local authorities, did in reality bring no discovery until after twelve hours' searching, when they seized three things—a letter from Charles Albert, addressed to my brother; one letter from Anselimo Lorenzo, speaking of a loan of 900 pesetas ($180), which I had given to 'la Salaridad Obrera' to hire an office, and a cipher for corresponding with Lerrout, many years old.

"The investigation then turned upon an impassioned revolutionary appeal made by me during the Free

Thought congress at Madrid, 1892. The judge thought he could see a connection between what I then wrote and what came to pass in 1909, seventeen years later.

"The judge left, leaving me in great anguish. I made up my mind that at the next examination I would with my whole soul protest against the effort to find in the long ago of my life proofs to justify conclusions as to the present.

"To-day the judge informed me that he had finished the examination of the written evidence, that one of these days I would be tried by a military tribunal, and he asked me to select my counsel from a list of officers whom I did not know. I then said to him that I had a great deal to say about the activities of the police. The judge replied that military law bears no resemblance to the civil code.

"So then it is all over, and I shall shortly be tried by persons, who, I very much fear, have not minds sufficiently free to quietly weigh the charges against me. . . .

"If I can I shall continue to-morrow. At present I am too exhausted. I will only say that this month in seclusion has been very hard on me, in a fetid cell, without air or light, and on convict diet. One has to be pretty strong to stand it.

"Good luck to all, all, all.

"FRANCISCO FERRER."

The second letter is as follows:

"The Prison Cell, Oct. 4, 1909.

"My Dear Friend—Notwithstanding most absolute innocence, the prosecutor demands the death penalty, based on denunciations of the police, representing me as the chief of the world's Anarchists and directing the labor syndicates of France, and of conspiracies and insurrections everywhere, declaring that my voyages to London and Paris were undertaken for no other object.

"With such infamous lies are they trying to kill me.

"FERRER."

"The messenger is about to depart and I have not time for more. All the evidence presented to the investigating judge by the police is nothing but a tissue of lies and calumnious insinuations. But no proofs against me, having done nothing at all.

"FERRER."

The following additional letter from Ferrer is published in the latest edition of *L'Humanité*. It is addressed to Mme. Charles Albert, in response to a letter from her inclosing funds contributed in Paris for his defense.

The letter reads:

"Please to tell Charles that a further proof of the prejudice of the judges toward me is seen in the fact that they have refused me a writ to the prison authorities permitting me to purchase things essential to my personal welfare, such as postage stamps, paper, telegrams, etc.

"They have gone much further than this and have refused to turn over to my lawyer a collection of the books of the Modern School, which I asked for, that I might expose the bad faith of the clericals on the subject of these schools. They have thus taken away from my lawyers the means of my defense.

"In a previous letter I have given a full account of my trial, where they were unable to find any charge against me." (This letter has not yet been received.) "The judge has searched everywhere and found nothing against me. He was obliged at last to call upon the supreme prosecutor, who had charged me with being the director of the rebellion, and demanded proofs of him. He was obliged to admit that he had no proof, but said that he had heard these things.

"My lawyer is certain of my acquittal so far as the facts are concerned, but he fears very much that the court will be influenced by the evil atmosphere that has been created around me. Freedom of the press only exists for the reactionary papers that speak against me. So far as the liberals are concerned, they are able to say nothing.

"All aid should be given to my lawyer in his efforts to secure publicity for the facts.

"Best wishes to all.

"FERRER."

OUR MARTYRED EDUCATOR

By C. L. JAMES.

WHATEVER effects the murder of our comrade, Francisco Ferrer, by the wretched Spanish government may have upon authority in general—let us hope they will be as extensive as predicted—one is sure the crime cannot fail to render more familiar than anything which ever happened before, the intimate connection between Anarchism and Knowledge.

When, some twenty years ago, the common-school instructed philosophers of the American patent-side weeklies used to talk, with their usual fatuous impertinence, about the "ignorant Anarchists" coming over from Europe, the present writer always told them that there were no ignorant Anarchists. Though he still believes that to have been true at the time, it can no longer be said—happily; for the fact that there are ignorant Anarchists now is proof how rapidly Anarchism spreads even where those obstacles against which it must contend are gravest. Less agreeable phenomena are that the ignorant Anarchists of such recent origin, and also some who are not ignorant—Tolstoy, particularly—were led to Anarchism by something else than that positive inductive method upon which increase of knowledge depends; and that, becoming Anarchists under the influence of piety or philanthropy, to which the crass practical atheism and barbarous cruelty of the governmental spirit are repellant, they retained, or picked up, a prejudice against the coldly intellectual truthfulness of science, expressing itself in such ways as revamping worn-out dogmatisms—Hedonism, Materialism, Equitism; as abuse of Malthus, because he reproved the principal error of that class in which his assailants felt most interest; as attacks on vaccination, because the meddling of government has made it oppressive, and on vivisection, because of its association with vaccination; upon medicine, because it is protected against quackery (very badly, of course) by law; even a disposition to run after such grotesque idols as faith-cure and mind-cure, because, forsooth, they are not medical science but its antithesis; upon Darwin, because his law of progress by selection *can* be perverted into a plea

for the privileged classes; upon his great disciple, only yesterday taken from us, because Lombroso's doctrine of degeneracy implied that those institutions which acted on their unenlightened zeal as a red rag acts upon a bull, had *causes;* nay, sometimes (with Bakunin and with Tolstoy) in sneers at all useful and all beautiful acts as at mere caterers to the pleasures of the idle rich. Such phases of the Movement in Favor of Ignorance were much to be regretted, because they could not be exploited, as they often were, in our periodicals, without strengthening the outside prepossession that Anarchism is a movement of the ignorant classes (!); because they could not go far enough without resolving Anarchism, like all movements which lose their hold on experimental investigation, into conflicting sects; because, in case of a revolution conducted largely by Anarchists they might give rise to acts which would make a frightful scandal and set back our propaganda indefinitely. It was necessary to assert with emphasis that Anarchism originated in study of facts; that every slave's inferiority is the necessary condition of his slavery; that the misuse of knowledge by authority is not knowledge itself; that ignorant innovations are never progressive, but always reactionary; that Knowledge only is Power; that to get and keep Power it is indispensable that those now poor should become rich in wisdom. And this, accordingly, has been done by all who could.

So much more, however, are men influenced through their emotions than their reason, that one drop of martyr blood goes further to persuade than many volumes of logic. That Francisco Ferrer was a distinguished educator; that the judicial murder of such a man was possible only in the land of the Inquisition; that his knowledge taught him Anarchism; that the principal excuse offered by his slayers was his establishing a school for the purpose of making Spaniards Anarchists by the simple process of making them scientists; that his death has roused to the anathematizing point those combined scientists of the world who prevented a somewhat more enlightened government than the Spanish from murdering Elisée Reclus; that against the bed-rock of the world's education, that tyranny which would so easily disperse a mob is beating itself, not vainly but suicidally; these are facts which must

teach both the newly born "ignorant Anarchist" and the doting ignorant Philistine that Anarchism derives invincibility from being the latest result of Science.

❧ ❧ ❧

IN MEMORY OF FRANCISCO FERRER

By C. E. S. WOOD.

I.

I see a Vision with her pearly feet
Caught in the silver shuttles of the sea,
Her head uplifted to the skyey seats
And all her form transcendent majesty;
Between her hands unfolds a scarlet scroll:
The martyred ones in her supreme emprise;
And, as she looks, black clouds in thunder roll
And lightnings are furious in her eyes.
'Tis Freedom,—Goddess of the Perfect Day,
So long delayed, and weary is the night,
The bloody scepter triumphing alway,
The people trampled by the heel of Might.
Tread thou the wine-press and with Vengeance come.
O, Freedom, stand not thus forever dumb!

II.

Accursed the law which may the helpless kill,
But still denies to helpless ones God's grace
If they the butcher's blood, in turn, shall spill.
I'll not believe it, till the starry space
Shall write in legends of celestial fire,
That man was made in mockery so rude,
Kings' flesh is sacred and but bloody mire
The throbbing hearts of all the multitude.
Away with this cursed enginery of Power;
Climb up above the bloody steps of thrones,
And, like the thunders of the Judgment Hour,
Proclaim afar, in trumpet throated tones:
"Ye who with laws have blacked the golden sky,
Your day is finished—prepare ye, too, to die!"

III.

Where stretch the skinny hands of starving men,
The children's fingers and the mad hag's claws,
To drag into Oblivion's den
The tyrants who proclaim unholy laws
Which murder Intellect and strangle Truth;
There, in the riot and the surging crowd,
I see the faces, void of Christly ruth,
Which centuries of Tyranny have plowed.
I see the cups they drink of dripping blood;
And there I see the ghostly faces, wan,
Of those who have black Tyranny withstood—
Cromwell and LaFayette, and Washington,
Urging, with pallid hands, the purging crew,
And whispering, "Lo, we were rebels, too."

IV.

Rebellion is Man's attribute of mind.
As rise the pregnant, overtoppling seas
In dark rebellion 'gainst the gusty wind,
So Man shall rise from supplicating knees
And hurl back Tyranny to an abyss
Fathomless beyond Time's deepest plummet-sound.
In that glad day of an ecstatic bliss
Man shall by Freedom radiantly be crowned.
All free! All free to think whate'er he will;
To speak whate'er he thinks, though strange it seems.
To keep whate'er he earns;—and none may kill.
Then, like the grandeur of the heavenly dreams,
Freedom shall wake and take men by the hand;
Kiss every brow and loosen every band.

THE MARTYRS OF NOVEMBER

By H. M. KELLY.

NOVEMBER with its leaden skies and melancholy sunsets reminds us inevitably that the most living, vital thing is the memory of man. Written on parchment, buried in the archives of State, carved in granite and stone, the Martyrs of November are enshrined in the hearts of men and are sure of an abiding place there when the other signs and symbols have crumbled and passed into oblivion.

Twenty-two years have passed since that spasm of fear and hatred swept over America, and five men were done to death on the shores of Lake Michigan. Followed in turn by a wave of grief and remorse through all classes of society, time but strengthens and beautifies our admiration for the heroic idealists who paid with their lives for being ahead of their time and age. We do not apologize for, nor seek to extenuate, any act the men of Chicago may have committed: to do so would be to insult the dead. If it be a crime to preach revolt against tryanny and oppression, then, indeed, they were guilty, and the best men in all times and ages are guilty with them. We would, if we could, blazon this from every housetop and assert with all the intensity of our being: the Chicago Martyrs did preach revolt against injustice and slavery, did preach liberty, justice, and humanity, and gloried in it unto the last.

They believed, as we believe, that no man has more right to the earth than any other man. That time does not sanctify robbery and oppression. If past generations submitted to wrongs and injustice, the present need not, must not, submit to a continuation of them. It cannot be repeated too early, or too often, that disbelieving in all statute law and having no voluntary part in its maintenance, Anarchists are not *morally* bound to obey laws made by others; but there is a moral obligation, resting upon those who believe in and maintain laws, to live up to them.

It is not now, nor was it in 1887, a recognized principle that men should be hanged or imprisoned for holding or voicing certain opinions, even when a resort to violence is advocated. Men are hanged and imprisoned for *acts* committed, not opinions uttered; and as the Martyrs of Chicago were legally hanged for acts they did not commit, we are more than justified in branding the crime of 1887 as a judicial murder, where men were done to death because they protested against a social system which robs, degrades, and kills the many for the benefit of the few. They were thinkers and agitators who neither committed, aided, nor abetted any crime, as is now all but universally recognized.

Social reformers and revolutionists are dangerous to the privileged class of their time and place, to the extent

of the truth their doctrine contains, the zeal with which they urge it, and the sacrifice they are willing to make for it. Dangerous indeed are men armed with so formidable a doctrine as Anarchism, propagated with such zeal as the Chicago men propagated it, and a willingness to make the one supreme sacrifice—life itself—for that ideal. Each man becomes a Samson, and eight Samsons became in the minds of the privileged class a force that would pull the temple of Mammon down and bury them, their crimes, and tyrannies in its ruins.

What grander and more irrefutable idea than that the earth is large enough and fruitful enough to feed all her children; that the earth is of no man's creation, and can therefore be no man's property. That men are brothers and should work according to their ability and consume according to their needs. That wars are barbarous as well as uneconomic, maiming and murdering the many for the aggrandizement of the few. That each individual should have the right to develop to his or her full capacity, developing not at the expense of another, but in the recognition that a harmonizing of ideas, blending of thoughts, a mutuality of interests is the greatest good attainable. What greater zeal can be imagined than that displayed by that tireless group preaching the gospel of man's deliverance, in season and out of season. Parsons, with eloquence—some say—worthy of Wendell Phillips, preaching to thousands on the Lake front, at Chicago, stirring their hearts and brains as none other of his time and place; Spies with his brilliant editorials, trenchant in attack, irrefutable in logic; Engel with his wonderful capacity for organization,—each in his place, and each doing his work as only man inspired can do. To picture in fancy these men, with faces beaming and hearts overflowing, is like living a beautiful dream. Then the climax and sacrifice.

The lessons of the tragedy of 1887 are manifold, but the one which appears to us basic is that Anarchism is in its essence an ethical idea and, as such, impregnable. To love man, not wisely but too well, has ever been a principle of martyrs, and thus it was with the Martyrs of November. Flattered by no hope of celestial bliss, inspired by no belief in immortality or undying fame, they faced an ignominious death unfalteringly, on behalf of

truth. Firm in their belief that a happy day was coming, they realized that it was necessary to offer sacrifices, from time to time, to inspire men to strive for it.

Freedom to live and work should be the heritage of all, instead of which it is only attained by unceasing struggle and constant sacrifice. Creeds rise and fall, systems are born and die, because some men are ahead of their time with new philosophies and religions; and here it is that the materialist conception of history fails us. Anarchism received a great impetus through the death of the Chicago men; it has grown and clarified, until today it is a force to be reckoned with. Not always with those who accept the philosophy or ally themselves with the movement, but with the fact that it expresses the best thought of our time and embodies in its principles the aspirations of man. An integrating and disintegrating force it is, destroying creeds and creating solidarity. It levels castes and develops equality, destroys thrones and brings justice and liberty ever nearer. Permeating all fields of human endeavor, from the dethroning of kings to the modernizing of churches, it comes quietly or in cataclysms, yet ever marching onward. In this great world-movement men who never heard of the Chicago Anarchists have been influenced by the same ethical principles: liberty and justice for all. They in turn are influencing the thought of the world. A world-concept, the idea of Anarchism circulates the globe, bringing men and women together regardles of race, creed, or nationality. To replace dogma and authority by freedom and rationality, to substitute solidarity for injustice is the goal.

For this ideal Spies, Parsons, Fisher, Engel, and Lingg marched proudly to their death, and for this we pay them homage. Idealizing their philosophy by their heroic sacrifice, they have inspired multitudes of men and women, and thus hastened the day of man's deliverance. When that day finally dawns, and mankind walks erect for the first time, we can not doubt that a free people will remember its heroes and martyrs, and pay them their meed of praise for the truths taught, ideals expressed, and sacrifices made.

THE FAILURE OF COMPROMISE

By ALEXANDER BERKMAN.

THE crushing slump in the Socialist vote in the New York elections accomplished at least one beneficial result: it has awakened the Socialist party to the realization of the utter ineffectiveness of its propaganda in this country.

In a thoughtful editorial the *Call* of November 4, analyzing the causes of the slump, reaches the justified conclusion that the *methods* of Socialist propaganda are at fault. Pursuing the subject further, the editor inquires what particular methods were responsible, and what changes are most needed. He confesses himself unable to find a satisfactory reply: "These are truly difficult questions. No individual can answer them. It will take the united ability and wisdom of the whole party in this city to discover our errors and to rectify them."

Without claiming to possess the "united ability and wisdom of the whole party," we make bold to attempt to answer this very vital, yet—in our opinion—by no means difficult question. The problem is very serious, indeed. Upon its proper solution rests, to a large extent, the future welfare of mankind.

There was a time when Socialism represented the highest aspirations of humanity, man's eternal thirst for liberty, for self-ownership. Then the banner of Socialism was the rallying point for the oppressed and disinherited of the world, who saw in Socialism the modern Messiah.

Socialist adherents grew and multiplied. The ideal of a regenerated society was a great educational force, attracting the best intellectual and social elements, who had found in Socialism complete satisfaction for their inmost soul hunger.

But with the growth of numbers came the sense of power and the desire for its increase. Forgetting that a world-revolutionizing ideal must necessarily make slow progress, the Socialist party became impatient and cast about for ways and means to hasten its growth. It understood that an uncompromising attitude towards all popular superstition, prejudices, and shams is not calculated to invite the speedy realization of Socialism. Im-

patience at slow but thorough results led the party into committing the fatal error of sacrificing principles for numbers.

Gradually it began to trim its sails. Step by step original Socialism was stripped of its elemental features. First came religion. It was not deemed "practical" to tread on the religious toes of the people. Religion was officially declared a "private affair." As was to be expected, this renegacy was rewarded by the addition of converts whose religious prejudices would have otherwise kept them away from the Socialist party. Increased numbers, and consequent greater power, developed a thirst for more. Still more trimming of sails followed, more compromises, with the inevitable result that, to-day, Socialism has almost entirely been shorn of its educational effect, the chief object being the gathering of voting material.

And while the party was dealing in compromises and "growing" in proportion, there developed within itself the spirit of rankest authority, suppression, and despotism. Internally and externally, Socialism had lost its original features: it could no longer satisfy the aspirations of true liberty-lovers. Nay, more; it became the hunting-ground of elements thoroughly conservative and Christian, who in turn impressed their intellectual and psychic stamp upon the principles and tactics of the party. The latter thus ceased to be an inspirational force and became a mere liberal-bourgeois political party, the great majority of whose membership have neither ideals nor principles beyond the Socialist usurpation of the government reins. Such a party, unable to hold out to its constituency the hope of immediate success, can be nothing more than the shuttlecock in the political game. Its members will vote for any candidate or party promising social reforms, however vain their pretensions. To such a contingent the Socialist party itself means nothing more.

The solution of the problem is therefore simple: Back to original principles and ideals. Let the motto be enlightment rather than political training. Real educational progress is slow, but sincere and permanent. The world is not to be regenerated by Socialist votes. Enlightened, liberty-loving men and women alone can accomplish it.

ADVENTURES IN THE DESERT OF AMERICAN LIBERTY

By E. G.

IN selecting this title for my traveling notes I little realized how significant it would prove.

"Adventures in the Desert of American Liberty"! Its barrenness and utter desolation were not new to me. Yet never did that desert seem more real, more deadening than when I reached Philadelphia.

There it was that American liberty was born; there, too, it has been stabbed to death; what is left of it, is but a hideous nightmare that benumbs the mind and weakens the spirit of the erstwhile liberty-loving Philadelphians.

Mindful of the petty police persecution in that city in 1901 and 1903, the Free Speech Committee wrote to Henry Clay, Director of Public Safety, informing him of our intention to test free speech. "Of course, he would not interfere with the right of free speech; he, the guardian of the City of Independence."

When I saw Henry Clay I realized how much he must have enjoyed the credulity of the Free Speech Committee. Credulity, indeed, to suppose that Henry Clay knows anything of Philadelphia's traditions in regard to liberty.

When Dr. Reitman presented himself before the watchdog at the City Hall, he found him suffering from hydrophobia. Such must have been the nature of the poor man's affliction. Else one could hardly account for his mad ravings against "that woman who will never speak in Philadelphia."

Some good friends have severely censured Dr. Reitman for his militant methods in dealing with the police. As a physician he probably knows that mad dogs, if not muzzled, are highly dangerous.

On the day of the meeting hallucinations set in at City Hall. The Director of Public Safety imagined himself the Russian Tsar. He despatched two Cossacks to my hotel, demanding that I submit my manuscript for the consideration and approval of His Majesty. That

I refused to do, of course. (I shall show later that what was self-evident to me, seemed "imprudent" and undiplomatic to some who call themselves liberals.)

In the evening the neighborhood of our hall had the appearance of being under martial law. When, in company with Mr. John H. Nelson (our attorney), I reached within half a block of the hall, we were charged by the brave two hundred and forced to go,—not where we chose (no such rights in the Independence City), but by the route mapped out for us by Henry Clay. The meeting, however, was "graciously" permitted to proceed.

The day after the memorable event, and for nearly four weeks, the real Philadelphia liberty reigned. I was shadowed by those most contemptible of all human professionals—detectives. Hotelkeepers were annoyed and harassed until they ordered us to leave. When I finally found shelter, the house was constantly watched, and the servant offered a bribe if only she would tell of the terrible conspiracies that were being hatched in my rooms.

The awe of authority is deeply rooted in the average American; even the liberal man and woman have implicit faith in it. This is no doubt the reason why American liberty has long since departed. The worship of law has taken its place.

During years of public activity I have often been reproached by many good people for attacking the machinery of government from the standpoint of theory rather than from experience. "There is nothing the matter with the law," they would say; "it's the abuse thereof. The police are arbitrary and despotic; they break the law; why not appeal to the courts? They surely will stand by constitutional rights."

Strangly and possibly inconsistent as it may seem to my comrades, I finally consented to appeal to the courts. Not because I believed that justice could possibly prevail; but because I wanted the court itself to substantiate the Anarchist contention so powerfully set forth by Ralph Waldo Emerson: "All governments, in essence, stand for tyranny."

As expected, the apeal was refused; but the grounds on which it was refused brand the court and govern-

ment more forcibly than the bitterest attacks of the wildest fanatic.

For the benefit of MOTHER EARTH readers I quote the major portion of the argument, as set forth by Judge Wilson:

> The question which the plaintiff would have us determine is, whether or not public officers, entrusted with the preservation of the peace, acting, as we ought to presume the defendants would, in the honest exercise of their judgment, should be restrained from prohibiting the delivery of lectures which would be likely to excite public disturbances and to result in a breach of the public peace. If such public officers should attempt to interfere in such a case, their interference would be justified, not upon the ground that the person to be affected by their action was an alien or a citizen, but by the knowledge that of dangerous and disturbing sentiments tending to disturb the peace would be uttered. We do not mean to say that an alien has the same or as full a right to attack the institutions of our country and to advocate the abolition of the constituted and constitutional government of the land that a citizen might have, but, so far as the case which is before us is concerned, we should regard the right of a citizen as no higher than that of an alien. The Constitution of Pennsylvania, in giving the right to citizens to speak freely, confers the right subject to their being held "responsible for the abuse of that liberty." The plaintiff is an avowed anarchist. However honest or able she may be, she does not hesitate to declare that, in her belief, all government should be abolished and that every citizen should regulate his or her own conduct according to his own views of what is right and wrong, and that force may be resorted to for the purpose of destroying government and establishing the right of individual independence from governmental control. It necessarily follows from the holding of such views that it would be considered as the right of any individual to determine, according to his own judgment, when the time arrives for the exercise of force to accomplish the destruction of government. That the utterance of such views in the community would be likely to excite such feelings and antagonism as would result in a breach of the peace, is by no means unlikely. It is not unreasonable to hold that such speech is an abuse of the liberty to speak freely on any subject. Whether it be a citizen or an alien who desires to advocate ideas which, if carried out, would naturally lead to the destruction of government, whose protection that person seeks, it would seem that, in the exercise of that right of self-preservation which belongs as well to governments as to individuals, such abuse of the right of free speech might, not unreasonably nor unlawfully, be prevented.
>
> That the plaintiff intended to advocate such destructive views as have been before mentioned, was admitted by her when examined before us. If she avowed a purpose of de-

livering a lecture advocating wholesale assassination of any class of public officers or persons, we think it would hardly be questioned that the peace officers of the city would be justified in preventing the utterances of such views. We are unable to perceive that there will be any well defined line of discrimination in such a case, one in which the views would be destructive of the life of the nation.

By the laws of the United States there is a discrimination against those who are known as Anarchists. The right of naturalization is forbidden to them and, when known, they are excluded from admission into the country. If when entering the country they are not known to belong to the class of disturbers and are afterwards discovered to belong to it, within a prescribed time they may be deported from the country. The ban of governmental disapproval is thus placed upon the utterance of sentiments such as the plaintiff holds and desires to advocate in public. We are asked to afford an opportunity for the poor Anarchist and advocates of the destructive and dangerous sentiments and to compel officers of the peace, notwithstanding they may be of the opinion that breaches of the peace would result therefrom, to abstain from interfering with the holding of public meetings for the expression of such ideas. This we do not feel called upon to do. It is a familiar principle of equity that plaintiffs cannot ask relief if they do not come into court with hands that are clean. We cannot avoid reaching the conclusion that one who openly and in advance announces the purpose of advocating such doctrines and sentiments as the plaintiff avows, is not within the class that can claim protection and relief from a court of equity.

It requires but little wisdom to see that Judge Wilson has made frantic efforts to get out of a dilemma. He failed, however. True, the decision has increased the arrogance of the police; but the decision also stands as the greatest indictment against the absurdity and cowardice of the law.

As I said before, I expected nothing better; I am, therefore, not disappointed.

The disappointing and discouraging feature of the Philadelphia experience is the utter lack of interest in the issue of free speech,—or if not indifference, it is certainly lack of spirit, absolute lack of backbone. The handful of liberals who were at first inclined to make a stand for free speech, because I was not "diplomatic" enough to let Henry Clay act as censor, withdrew their assistance. The party Socialists played the usual sorry part, as in all questions of liberty. As to the public at large, no other city represents such a white-livered specimen. To put red blood in its veins it will have to be

clubbed still more, and starved and kicked about. And even then it may never give birth to the spirit of revolt.

It is hardly credible, but nevertheless true, that the Philadelphians will stand more bullying than any European people I know. When, after four weeks of a complete despotic reign, of the stopping of a Ferrer memorial,—though held in all monarchical countries,—after four weeks of petty persecution and torture the police of Philadelphia broke up a private meeting in a private house, a few meek voices were heard to protest. Not against the reign of terror. Oh, no; but against the invasion of the sacred rights of property. Oh, yes, the Philadelphians, like all Americans, are sensitive in that respect.

Yet, even Philadelphia deserves to be saved, because of her two wonders: Mrs. Weda Addicks, a Socialist bigger than her party, and—a thrice blessed wonder, a Baptist minister, Rev. Cooper Ferris. Weda Addicks, outside of our own immediate comrades, was a friend indeed. She helped in every way possible to interest people, but soon found herself facing an iron wall. Rev. Ferris protested very loudly, delivered a sermon on Anarchism which, I hear, was very good. He also tried to get his congregation to take a stand, but out of eight hundred only thirty-eight had the courage to go on record.

A few contributed small sums to aid the fight, but were so fearful of public opinion that they did not dare to allow their names to be used.

Under such impossible circumstances why throw pearls before swine? Why exert energy on free speech for people who have neither ideas to express nor rights to exercise? Such is the reasoning of my practical, utilitarian friends.

Fortunately, I am neither. Nor am I particularly concerned whether or not the Philadelphians want free speech. *I want it,* and having learned that unless one is willing to take his rights, they will never be given to him, I do not yet consider the Philadelphia chapter closed.

Judge Wilson "kindly" informs us, that as "avowed Anarchists" we are not entitled to protection. That

absolves us from any consideration or recognition of the position of Judge Wilson and the institution he represents. Anarchists need no protection. But a government that will put a ban on any set of people, for their ideas, must protect itself, for it is indeed in danger.

OUR POLICE CENSORSHIP*

By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE

FELLOW-MEN:

I have written my speech; I generally write my speech. We have a censor, and the censor may call me to account. He has some reporters here; and in their anxiety to earn their money, and their shortage of intelligence, they are likely to report me as uttering a lot of idiocy which the censorship wishes me to utter, in order to excuse its illegal, unconstitutional, and tyrannical action. To illustrate the mental caliber of the servants of the law, who are set to judge what you, the people, ought to be allowed to hear, I will relate a little incident of last week. A policeman, straying into a cigar store for a rest, remarked to the young lady at the counter, "Think of a woman like Emma Goldman wanting to speak!"

"Well," said the lady, "why shouldn't she speak if she wants to? How do you know that what she was going to say was bad when you didn't let her even open her mouth?"

"Oh," replied Sapience, "everybody knows what she's going to say. Why, she carries a red flag with her; everybody knows red means danger."

Now, this person has doubtless been trained to know that a red lantern over a break in the curbstone signifies danger; or a little red flag put up in the middle of the street means a place to be walked around; and he probably conceives that Emma Goldman has appropriated one of these little flags and runs around waving it, notifying all the people that she is dangerous. Upon sources of information like these, the censorship depends for its knowl-

---

* Address delivered October 8, 1909, in Philadelphia, at a public meeting of protest against the police suppression of Emma Goldman's lectures.

edge of what Anarchists preach; therefore I have written my speech,—that policemen may not put incendiarism in my mouth.

If I stand here and say, for instance, that I believe in the abolition of great cities, because I think they are an infinite evil in human life, full of corruption and tyranny; that I think humanity would, if free, spread itself out, and distribute itself in small communities over the now waste lands of the globe, some policeman is likely to go to Timothy O'Leary, and say that I said the proper thing to do would be to tear up the pavements and bombard the city hall; that is about as correct an understanding of the word "abolition" as a policeman is capable of; and *upon intelligences like these the rights of citizens depend.* Not upon the Constitution; not upon the bill of rights; but upon the man with the club.

Now, against this man with the club, I am here to declare, and I shall keep on declaring until the club stops my mouth, for the unlimited freedom of speech. I happen to be a citizen of this country, through no fault of mine, but I want no freedom for myself that I do not want for every other human being, citizen of *this* country or citizen of the *world.*

More than this: You know the story of the Bell of Atri? The bell which any one with a grievance might ring and call the council together for a hearing? You know how the vine grew around the bell-rope till one day an old worn-out horse, turned by his thankless owner upon the highway to crop his living as he might, pulled at the vine-leaves till the great bell rang loud to all the people the Wrong of the Dumb? I have said often and often in our struggles to maintain a free platform for all, and I say again, that if any old sad belabored dray-horse could be gifted with the power of speech to tell his wrong (and if the wrongs that men have done to beasts in maintaining this accursed civilization had left their mark, there is not a paving-stone in the city that would not glow rust-red), that old sad slave should be welcomed by us, and be free to have his say. That is what I want—freedom for any one to speak, freedom for any one to listen to what he pleases, to whom he pleases.

It doesn't matter who Emma Goldman is, nor where she comes from, nor what she has to say. Lawyers and

judges may quibble and define use and abuse, and liberty and license, and rigmarole and rolemarig. But I will stand for the whole thing—nothing less. The newspapers of this city have published the most bitter and virulent lies about Anarchists. Some of them have, on such occasions as seemed to make the utterance popular, declared editorially that the only proper place for an Anarchist is decorating a rope swung over a lamp-post. They said these things, and ministers of the gospel of Christ offered to head mobs to hang us, here in this city; and if that is not inciting to riot and endangering life, I wonder what is. And I stand for their freedom to say it; I stand for their freedom to lay bare all the inward brutality and barbarism of their souls; but I stand likewise for my right and every other man's, woman's, child's, to say that those "who take the sword shall perish by the sword"; that not by force and law and servitude shall humanity advance towards the great goal which no man knows in its entirety, but which looms dimly upon us through the opening future; but through freedom, through the abolition of restriction, through self-asserting manhood, which does not fear to speak its mind, nor to listen when others speak, nor to let others listen to what they will.

Now, who is Emma Goldman, and what had she to say, that Director Clay and Timothy O'Leary should take away the right of the inhabitants of Philadelphia to hear her speak; should assume in advance that what she would say would upset the peace of the community?

She is a direct and fearless person, who for many years has been the target of police attacks. Away back in 1893 she addressed a meeting of unemployed people in New York, and told them precisely what Cardinal Manning said; viz., that "A starving man has a natural right to his neighbor's bread." The difference was that Cardinal Manning said it in a fifty-cent magazine which the people couldn't buy, and Emma Goldman said it directly to starving men. Now, they didn't take their neighbor's bread; they didn't riot; they went away quietly and went on starving. But the State of New York sent Emma Goldman to Blackwell's Island for a year. From that time on, no matter where she has spoken, the police have sought to interfere with her; they have attached every

disagreeable publicity to her name that they could; they have seized every occasion to charge her with responsibility for other people's actions. They have put lies into a dead man's mouth in order to victimize her. And for all that, notwithstanding all the times they have arrested her, notwithstanding the prejudices of the people due to public misrepresentation, and the facility of courts, they have never succeeded in convicting her of anything since 1893.

Why do they continue it? It is, indeed, beyond the comprehension of reasoning people. But then the police are not reasoning people. Reasoning people, such for instance as the Editor of the *Public Ledger,* say that such assumption of power on the part of a Director of Public Safety is intolerable tyranny; Mr. Ledger says that he wishes all Anarchists could be silenced, but not by force; by the good sense of the public who should abstain from listening to us. Now that is fair; the man thinks we are a nuisance, thinks that our doctrines are not worthy of attention, and says so. All right; he is entitled to his opinion, and the method he advises for silencing us is a very Anarchistic one. It involves no force, no denial of freedom. It's precisely what I myself do with the *Ledger* about fifty weeks out of every fifty-two. I don't read it, —or any other newspaper.

If what we have to say appears to be worthy of consideration to those who freely choose to listen to us, then let them consider and discuss it; if they think they can refute it, let them try to do so; if they think what we say is ridiculous, let them laugh at it; if they think we are beneath attention, let them pass us by on the other side; but let them not endeavor to close our mouths by the strong hand.

That is a method to which tyrants have ever resorted, and by which they, in the long run, reap the whirlwind.

Men and women who have some pride of the free human being yet within you, I appeal to you to make the cause of the free word, and the free right of assemblage, *your cause.* Let FREE SPEECH be heard on every street corner, till the very politicians will for shame adopt it. If the people, the people at large, speak, and demand free speech for the most hated—for free speech means that: it was never necessary to declare freedom to say what those

in power believe—then we shall have a real Declaration of Independence—not on paper, but in will and act.

FREE SPEECH RECALLED

By HARRY BOLAND.

DO you remember how Gulliver, when he lay down upon the ground to sleep, was set upon by the lilliputians, who proceeded to bind him with tiny threads. He, no doubt, smiled, feeling his own security, when he first became aware of their purpose. But while he slumbered they worked on, thread by thread until, when at last he awoke, he found it impossible to free himself. Now the people of America to-day are in Gulliver's position. They feel that they are free and they accept each new invasion of their rights with the same nonchalance with which he viewed the little thread which was soon to enmesh him. Truly eternal vigilance is the price of liberty; a small price, but apparently too much to ask of the average man of to-day. The men who designed our nation, who framed her laws, were not afraid to pay the price. And dearly did they pay, as pay they must who live for an ideal. History is full of instances, too numerous to recount, of those who have gone to stake, to gibbet, to gallows. The early American patriots did not escape calumny, contempt, and condemnation. But those things were as little or nothing to them, for they had in view the perfect Republic which Americans to-day are forgetting. The debt they paid to the ignorant lovers of things increased in proportion as they worked for the bringing about of their ideals. Theirs was not our twentieth century impudence. They had faith in their integrity, but did not consider themselves infallible. They knew that time would bring changes, and that the Constitution, left in the hands of a selfish few, might suffer from misinterpretation. Therefore they declared our independence in words like these: "When a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce the people

under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government."

But you cannot declare any man independent. Who would be free, himself must strike the blow. No man can receive any more liberty than he is capable of. If the desire for freedom is not there, freedom will not come to anyone.

Most Americans love liberty. If once awakened to the fact that theirs is slowly but surely being taken from them, and when the realization brings with it the sense of their own responsibility, they will arouse and change things.

No one could have witnessed the outrageous manner in which the right to free speech and free assembly was clubbed to death in this city (Philadelphia), on Tuesday, September 28, without always feeling that a shameful injustice had been done, and that all who did not protest were in reality as much to blame as those who forcibly prevented Emma Goldman from speaking.

Habit has encrusted our nature like a robe of dust. We know that things were not always as they are, that they are not right and must be changed, but most of us are perfectly willing to let the other fellow do the changing.

It seems natural to us, because we have suffered from the dominance of parents, that all our relationships of life should be based upon the same master-and-slave notion. Tyranny begins at home, and we bear it wherever we encounter it. In the mercantile world, in marriage, from the press, from the pulpit, we are such dependent fibre that we hand over our dearest rights to the man or woman who is foxy enough to appropriate them, and it is generally to some rogue.

We know that the spirit of 1776 was for the largest kind of universal liberty. The framers of the Declaration and the Constitution were hampered only by the language they used in making it clear that America was to be FREE. Why should we sit down, then, in this awful state of acquiescence and see our dearest rights invaded?

It is up to us individually, for

Humanity's strife humanity must pursue,
Or many eat the bread sweat-won by few.
Thrice feeble who, their strength untried, unknown,
Reap, folded-handed, where they have not sown.

TO LOVERS OF LIBERTY

TO all lovers of Liberty, Justice, and Equality,—to those who would perpetuate the memory of our martyred comrades, this appeal is addressed.

I intend to republish the speeches delivered by Albert R. Parsons, August Spies, Louis Lingg, Adolph Fischer, George Engel, Michael Schwab, Oscar Niebe, and Samuel Fielden, in Judge Gary's Court, at Chicago, Oct. 7-8-9, 1886, in answer as to "why sentence of death should not be pronounced" upon them.

These speeches, as some of the readers are doubtless aware, were published at the time they were delivered, and had a large sale. They contain a concise history of the Labor Movement of twenty-five years ago, and for this reason are valuable to every working man and woman.

They are the last message to the world from men who were under sentence of death for no reason but their devotion to the cause of their class.

About $500 will be required to publish the speeches. I feel exceedingly anxious about this matter, as I am the last of the living active ones who worked with them, and I fear should I die before I accomplish this, they may never be published.

Comrades, will you assist me?

LUCY E. PARSONS.

GENERAL FREE SPEECH FUND

RECEIPTS.

Jos. Fels, Phila., $100; Italian Labor Union, per E. G., N. Y., $25; Collection per Dr. Reitman, M. E. Ball, N. Y., $17.50; Collection New Haven E. G. Meeting, $12. *Per Lists:* M. Kisluik, Atlantic City, N. J., $7; H. Kaufman, Minneap., Minn., $5.90; H. Michailowitz, N. Y., $5; Miss B. Lowensohn, N. Y., $5.15; S. Di Gisi, N. Y., $3.70; H. Machetto, West Hoboken, N. J., $3.60; Miss Rebecca Edelsohn, N. Y., $3.55; J. Miller, Houston, Texas, $3.35. Miss B. Lowinsohn, N. Y., $2; James and Rose Shoob, Brooklyn, N. Y., $2; per Wm. Erichsen, N. Y., $2; per J. Handler, N. Y., $1.85; per Miss T. Gelfenbein, N. Y., $1.15; Dr. Rose Fritz, N. Y., $1; Dr. R. Leverson, N. Y., $1; A. H. Garner, Hannibal, Mo., $1; J. H. Root, Wash., D. C., $1; J. H. Grigsby, Louisville, Ky., 50c.; L. Rosen, N. Y., 25c..

PER LEONARD D. ABBOTT, CHAIRMAN F. S. C.

Eugene Walter, N. Y., Dr. E. B. Foote, N. Y., each, $20; Fr. P. Walsh, Kansas City, Mo,. H. Bool, Ithaca, N. Y., each, $10; D. C. Spaulding, S. F.; H. Roberts, Butte, Mont.; Joe L. Rosby, N. Y.; Wm. B. Du Bois, Bayonne, N. J.; D. Kiefer, Cincin., O.; M. Hornstein, London, Can.; C. B. Hoffman, Enterprise, Kan.; W. C. Owen, Los Angeles, Cal.; H. Korbgoweit, Mt. Pleasant, Pa.; Mrs. A. S. Forrester, La Cañyada, Cal.; S. Rosenbloom, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Dr. H. Tropp, N. Y.; Mrs. A. Sterling, N. Y.; each $5. Per F. Pavel, S. Wilmington, Ill., $3.10; M. Zaslaw, Brkl'n; R. T. Paine, W. Hoboken, N. J., each, $3. Natasha Notkin, Phila.; Gertrude Barnum, N. Y.; Theo Tietz, Hartford, Conn.; Fr. Rathbun, N. Y.; B. Capes, St. Louis, Mo.; M. Polsky, Coffeyville, Kas.; Abe Isaac, Jr., N. Y.; Dr. Ch. Andrews, N. Y.; each, $2. Ed. Wenning, Cincin., O.; Th. McKeone, Cincin., O.; Geo. Hoffeller, N. Y.; Thos. Brothers, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Fay Lewis, Rockford, Ill.; Abe Bregman, St. Louis, Mo.; Carl Gleesen, Kansas City, Mo.; Dr. Geo. Pyburn, Sacramento, Cal.; H. Schad, St. Louis, Mo.; J. B. Wheeler, Chicago, Ill.; each, $1. Mrs. L. Acitelli, Dudley, Pa., 55c.; Anna Edelstadt, Butte, Mont., 50c.; Dr. C. D. Spivak, Denver, Colo., 50c.—Total, $337.15.

EXPENDITURES.

Deficit, as per Sept. acc't....	$74.90	Brooklyn	25.00
To Printer, Facsimile letter of Newark mayor	8.00	To Stenographer and Typewriter	5.00
To Printer, stationery.....	7.50	To Chairman F. S. C., postage.	5.00
Postage	7.00		$159.40
To Printer, 500 F. S. Circulars	4.50	Total	$337.15
To Printer, stationery.....	7.50	Expenditures	$159.40
To I. W. W., Spokane, for Free Speech Fight.....	15.00		$177.75
Police Suppressed Meeting,			

PHILADELPHIA FREE SPEECH FUND

RECEIPTS.

A Friend, Philadelphia, $50; F. S. Meeting Receipts, Phila., $53; Collection E. G. Meeting, Phila., $20; Collection Yom Kippur Meeting, Phila., $18.50; Collection F. S. Meeting, Phila., $17; Per A. Brandschein, Phila., $11; Per E. G., Atlantic City, $11; Collection Harlem Lib. Alliance, N. Y., $10; Bolton Hall, N. Y., $10; J. Rosby, Phila., $10; H. B., Phila., $10; Collection V. D. Cleyre Lecture, H. L. Alliance, N. Y., $7.31. A Friend, Phila.; W. E. Jackson, Phila.; S. W. Cooper, Phila.; Th. E. White, Phila.; Mrs. W. Addicks, Phila.; Fr. Stephens, Phila.; Voltairine de Cleyre, Phila.; H. Shenk, Phila.; Dr. Cary, Phila.; Sunrise Club, N. Y., per Bolton Hall; Workmen's Circle, Br. 126, Atlantic City, N. J.; Collection per V. de Cleyre, Phila.; each, $5; List per V. de Cleyre, Phila., $4.30; Per M. Rosen, Phila., $2.55; Roy Cigar Factory, per A. Brandschein, Phila., $2.05; Mr. Nadro, Phila., M. Shulman, Phila., each, $2; Five physicians, Phila., each $1; Horace Traubel, E. M. Wolfe, each $1; Per Ida Maryson, $1.25; Druggist, Phila., 50c.—Total, $309.46.

EXPENDITURES PHILA. F. S. F.

Counsel Fees	$100.00	Phila., E. G. & L. D. Abbott	15.00
Free Speech Meeting, (Rent, Advert., Speaker's R. R. fare, Stenogr., Signs.)....	80.00	Special Representative sent to Phila., Miss S. C.....	10.00
Postage, Telegr., & Teleph...	7.00		$322.00
Stenogr. Work for the Press.	5.00	Expenditures	$322.00
Exp. to Atlantic City.....	5.00	Receipts	309.46
E. G. & B. R. expenses 4 weeks	100.00	Deficit	$12.54
Several trips between N. Y. &			

NOTE:—We hope our comrades will avail themselves of this special Ferrer issue to order extra copies for propaganda purposes. Orders of 50 copies or more will be filled at 7c per copy.